arXiv:1610.07478v1 [quant-ph] 24 Oct 2016

Upper Bounds on Systoles of High-Dimensional Expanders Using Quantum Codes

Lior Eldar* Maris Ozols† Kevin F. Thompson‡

October 25, 2016

Abstract

Existence of quantum LDPC codes whose minimal distance scales linearly with the number of qubits is a major open problem of both practical interest and theoretical importance. The growing field of high-dimensional expanders in recent years has had increasing interaction with quantum theory and presents a possibility of providing an affirmative resolution of the quantum LDPC conjecture. Indeed, existence of high-dimensional expanders of *bounded degree* and large *systole* and co-systole would translate into quantum codes with low-weight parity checks and large distance.

Alas, we show that trying to leverage the mere "random-like" appearance of such high-dimensional expanders to find good quantum codes may be futile: d-complexes that are ε-far from perfectly random, with $\varepsilon \ll 1$, have a *systole* with small Hamming weight. In particular, if the complex has n vertices, we bound the size of its systole by $\tilde{O}(\varepsilon^{1/(2d)})n$. Quantum codes aside, our work places a first upper-bound on the systole of high-dimensional expanders with small *discrepancy*, and specifically Ramanujan complexes [Lub14].

Contents

1 Introduction **2**
1.1 General . . . 2
1.2 Quantum error correction . . . 4
1.3 High-dimensional expanders . . . 5
1.4 CSS codes: connecting quantum codes to high-dimensional expanders . . . 7
1.5 Discussion and previous work . . . 7
1.6 Overview of the proof . . . 8
1.6.1 An ε-PR hyper-graph spans a weakly-binomial subspace . . . 9
1.6.2 Weakly-binomial subspaces with LDPC duals have large dimension . . . 9

2 Preliminaries **10**
2.1 Notation . . . 10
2.2 Kravchuk polynomials . . . 11
2.3 The Sloane-MacWilliams transform . . . 13
2.4 Markov chains . . . 14

*Center for Theoretical Physics, MIT
†Department of Applied Mathematics and Theoretical Physics, University of Cambridge
‡School of Engineering and Applied Science, Harvard

3 An ε-PR complex spans a weakly-binomial subspace **16**
3.1 Weight enumerators as stationary distributions 16
3.2 Stationary distributions 17
3.3 Proof of Lemma 28 18

4 Weakly-binomial spaces have bounded minimal distance **19**

5 Proof of Theorem 1 **22**
5.1 Note on the proof 23

A Technical estimates **23**

B Acknowledgments **25**

1 Introduction

1.1 General

Quantum error-correcting codes (QECCs) and *high-dimensional expanders* are two distinct fields, with somewhat disparate motivations. Quantum error correction studies the ability to efficiently encode quantum information in a way that is robust against errors induced by environment [LB13, NC11]. The study of QECCs is thus motivated by "practical" reasons (e.g. building a quantum computer), but also relates to our basic understanding of multi-particle entanglement. On the other hand, the nascent study of high-dimensional expanders (see for example [Lub14]) is motivated by an attempt to replicate the enormous success of 1-dimensional expanders, namely *expander graphs*, in theoretical computer science and mathematics more broadly [HLW06a, Lub12]. In this field, one attempts to provide a "natural" generalization of expansion to hyper-graphs in a way that inherits the fundamental properties of expander graphs, perhaps the most prominent of these being the tight connection between spectral properties (spectral gap) and combinatorial properties (Cheeger constant) [Che69, Alo86]

We will be interested in the notion of a *chain complex* from homological algebra. For a given dimension d, a chain complex $\mathcal{X} = (X_0, X_1, \ldots, X_d)$, or simply a *d-complex*, is a sequence of linear spaces X_i (over $\mathbb{F}_2$) together with linear maps $\partial_i : X_i \to X_{i-1}$ between them. For each i we define a linear map $\partial_i : X_i \to X_{i-1}$ (also known as a *boundary operator*), much like the incidence matrix of a graph encodes the relationships between edges and vertices. It is well-known for a while now [Kit97, BK01] that a 2-dimensional chain complex gives rise - in a fairly natural way - to a certain QECC called CSS code (see Section 1.4 for more details). However, until very recently this connection was not very well articulated, partly because quantum codes were considered most prominently on regular grids in low dimensions (see, e.g. [Bom13]).

Yet, in recent years, it has become more evident that there may be some deep connections between these two questions. On one hand, in the context of QECCs, new constructions of quantum CSS codes have diverged from the rigid lattice-based topology that has been pervasive thus far to accommodate far more robust and, in a sense, "expanding" topologies [LTZ15, Has16]. These topologies, as it turns out, have provided an added advantage in terms of decodability and minimal distance. It thus appears that basing quantum codes on expanding topologies, which are local but not *spatially* local, may go a long way in improving our QECC capability in many respects.

On the other hand, there is significant and recent progress in our understanding of specific types of high-dimensional expanders, specifically co-boundary and co-systole expanders. In this

context, recent studies by Kaufman, Kazhdan and Lubotzky [KKL16], and subsequent work by Evra and Kaufman [EK16], have established that certain efficiently constructible d-dimensional complexes, called Ramanujan complexes, possess a property called co-systole expansion. This property generalizes the notion of combinatorial expansion in expander graphs and, perhaps more generally, the notion of local testability of combinatorial properties [KL14]. A construction of a co-systole expander with a further property of Poincaré duality would imply an affirmative solution to the qLDPC conjecture and to the the NLTS conjecture [EH15], which are major open problems in quantum information theory [FH14].

Arguably, the most important facet in the intersection of high-dimensional expanders and quantum codes, is the question of the minimal error-correcting distance, in QECC terminology, or systole, in topology terms. In concrete terms, assuming a high-dimensional complex with arbitrarily good expansion parameters, can one solve (or at least approach) the quantum LDPC conjecture (qLDPC) that posits the existence of locally-constrained quantum codes with linear distance (see Conjecture 3)? In this work, we show that simply trying to leverage the random-looking property of high-dimensional expanders to construct quantum codes with large distance, may be futile.

Specifically, we consider d-dimensional simplicial complexes that satisfy a high-dimensional generalization of being pseudo-random. First though, a 1-dimensional simplicial complex, i.e. *graph*, is denoted by $G = (V, E)$ and is said to be *K-regular* if each vertex is adjacent to exactly K others, and *ε-pseudo-random* if, for any sets $A, B \subseteq V$,

$$\left| \frac{1}{K}|E(A,B)| - \frac{1}{n}|A| \cdot |B| \right| \leq \varepsilon \sqrt{|A| \cdot |B|},$$

where $n = |V|$ is the number of vertices. If we divide both sides by $n/2$, we can interpret this relation as follows: the total fraction of the edges crossing the cut $\frac{|E(A,B)|}{(nK/2)}$ is very close to $\frac{2|A|\cdot|B|}{n^2} \approx \frac{|A|\cdot|B|}{\binom{n}{2}}$, the fraction of edges crossing the cut in the complete graph, up to some constant additive error ε. Alternatively, if we fix the cut (A, B) and we pick some uniform random edge e_1 from the complete graph, and some uniform edge from our expander graph e_2, the probability that edge e_1 crosses the cut is the same as the probability that e_2 crosses the cut, again up to some small additive error ε. It is well-known by a result of [AC88] that graphs with spectral gap ε are ε-pseudo-random. This well-known result is the *expander mixing lemma* and a converse due to Bilu and Linial [BL06], establishes that pseudo-randomness in fact *characterizes* expander graphs.

We define a generalization of this notion on hyper-graphs akin to the definition of Parzanchevski [Par13]. Let $\mathcal{X}$ be a d-dimensional complex on n. Denote the set of d-faces as E. For any $S \subseteq [n]$ a subset of the vertices, and for any $j \leq d$, define $A(S, j)$ to be the number of d-faces in E with j members in S. Then $\mathcal{X}$ is said to be *ε-pseudo-random* (ε-PR) if for all subsets of the vertices, $S \subseteq [n]$ we have:

$$\left| \frac{A(S,j)}{|E|} - \binom{d}{j} \left(\frac{|S|}{n}\right)^j \left(1 - \frac{|S|}{n}\right)^{d-j} \right| < \varepsilon \tag{1}$$

In [Par13, PRT16] Parzanchevski establishes a high-dimensional analog of the expander mixing lemma, by showing that for any simplicial complex, if its Laplace operator is spectrally gapped, then it is also pseudo-random.

In this paper, we refer to a natural and well-established map from 2-complexes to quantum error correcting codes known has homological CSS codes [BMD07]. Specifically, we consider a 2-complex $\mathcal{X} = (X_0, X_1, X_2)$ with boundary maps $\partial_2 : X_2 \to X_1$ and $\partial_1 : X_1 \to X_0$. We will associate the stabilizers of the quantum code to the images of the maps ∂_2, ∂_1^T. For instance we

will assign the rows of ∂_1 to (a generating set of) Pauli-Z check operators, and the columns of ∂_2 to (a generating set of) Pauli-X check operators. This can be done by mapping each binary vector $b \in \mathrm{im}(\partial_1^T) \in \mathbb{F}_2^n$ to $\bigotimes_{i=1}^n Z^{b(i)}$ (and the corresponding map for X operators).

We then consider families of such 2-complexes of *bounded degree* $K_1, K_2 = O(1)$, i.e. the Hamming weight of each column of ∂_2 and each row of ∂_1 is K_2 and K_1 respectively. We will use the notation $d = O(1)$ to denote the maximum Hamming weight of each row of ∂_2 and column of ∂_1, i.e. the *locality* of the Pauli stabilizers defining the CSS code. Our main theorem relates to the above notion of pseudo-randomness and shows that the natural CSS quantum code arising from an ε-pseudo-random 2-complex has a stringent *upper bound* on its minimal distance:

Theorem 1. ***Small discrepancy implies small quantum distance***
Let $\{\mathcal{X}_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ be a family of 2-complexes

$$\mathcal{X}_n : X_2 \xrightarrow{\partial_2} X_1 \xrightarrow{\partial_1} X_0, \tag{2}$$

where each column of ∂_2 and each row of ∂_1 has weight $d = O(1)$, each row of ∂_2 has weight $K_2 = O(1)$, and each column of ∂_1 has weight $K_1 = O(1)$. Denote by $\mathcal{C}(\mathcal{X}_n) = [[n, k, d_{min}]]$ the quantum code associated to $\mathcal{X}_n$. Let

$$\varepsilon_0 = \min\left\{\left(H^{-1}(2^{-2\log(2d)/d})\right)^{2d}, 2^{-2d}\right\}.$$

If $\mathcal{X}_n$ is ε-PR, where $\varepsilon \leq \varepsilon_0$, then $d_{min} \leq \frac{12}{d^2}\varepsilon^{1/(2d)}\log^2(1/\varepsilon)n$.

One can also interpret this theorem as a statement about high-dimensional expanders which does not use the language of quantum codes (see Section 1.2 for relevant definitions). For example, using the definition of systole / co-systole expansion due to Evra and Kaufman [EK16] we claim:

Theorem 2. ***Pseudo-random complexes have bounded systoles***
Let $\{\mathcal{X}_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ be a family of 2-complexes, with $\mathcal{X}_n$ as in Eq. (2) and $\dim(X_1) = n$, where each column of ∂_2 and each row of ∂_1 has weight $d = O(1)$ and each row of ∂_2 has weight $K_2 = O(1)$ and each column of ∂_1 has weight $K_1 = O(1)$. If $\mathcal{X}_n$ is ε-PR then

$$\mathrm{syst}_1(\mathcal{X}_n) \leq \frac{12}{d^2}\varepsilon^{1/(2d)}\log^2(1/\varepsilon)n.$$

Since by [EK16] Ramanujan complexes are co-systole expanders, then in particular the co-systole $\mathrm{syst}^1(\mathcal{X}_n) \geq c_0 n$ for some constant c_0. Hence there exists $\varepsilon' = \varepsilon'(c_0)$ such that these complexes have discrepancy at least ε'.

1.2 Quantum error correction

The study of quantum error correcting codes is driven by the high-level goal of making quantum information robust against environment-induced errors. Generally speaking, a quantum error correcting code (QECC) for encoding k qubits into n, with $n \geq k$, is a an isometry

$$V : \mathcal{H} := (\mathbb{C}^2)^{\otimes k} \hookrightarrow \mathcal{H}' := (\mathbb{C}^2)^{\otimes n}$$

that protects quantum states by "spreading" them out over a larger subspace. Specifically, for any Pauli error $\mathcal{E} := \mathcal{E}_1 \otimes \cdots \otimes \mathcal{E}_n$, where each $\mathcal{E}_i \in \{I, X, Y, Z\}$ is one of the four Pauli matrices, in which at most d_{min} terms $\mathcal{E}_i$ are different from the identity matrix I, any two orthogonal states $|\psi_1\rangle, |\psi_2\rangle \in \mathcal{H}$ remain orthogonal under $V^\dagger \mathcal{E} V$:

$$\langle\psi_1|V^\dagger \mathcal{E} V|\psi_2\rangle = 0.$$

Hence a *logical state* $|\psi\rangle$, after being encoded as $V|\psi\rangle$, can be recovered from any error that acts on at most $\lfloor \frac{d_{min}-1}{2} \rfloor$ qubits. As in the study of classical error correction, one then usually looks for efficient ways to encode and decode quantum states, and to achieve optimal parameters in terms of rate and minimal distance.

In QECCs, as in classical ECCs, one can define a code $\mathcal{C}$, namely a subspace of $\mathcal{H}'$, as the space stabilized by a set of parity checks P_i - namely: a quantum state $|\psi\rangle \in \mathcal{C}$ if $P_i|\psi\rangle = 0$ for each i. In classical ECCs, when the P_i's are sparse, then the resulting code is said to be a low-density parity-check code, or LDPC for short.

In classical ECC, LDPC codes can be easily achieved, even by randomly sampling a bi-regular graph and associating parity checks according to its connectivity. This can be shown, for example, using the Sipser–Spielman expander code construction [SS96]. Yet in the quantum setting no such constructions are known. In fact, it is unknown how to even achieve a quantum code with linear distance using a sparse set of checks, for any non-zero rate:

Conjecture 3 (qLDPC Conjecture)**.** *There exists a quantum code $\mathcal{C}$ of positive rate with a set of parity checks P_i, each of which can be written as $P_i = I_a \otimes p_i \otimes I_b$, where p_i is a matrix of dimension at most 2^K for $K = O(1)$, such that $d_{min}(\mathcal{C}) = \Omega(n)$.*

The qLDPC conjecture is not a mere question about optimality of parameters. In a sense, it goes to the core of our understanding of multi-particle entanglement since the states corresponding to code-words of a quantum code with linear distance can be shown to be highly-entangled in a well-defined sense. The existence of a qLDPC code with linear distance implies that, using only "local" constraints, we can enforce a "global" phenomenon such as entanglement that scales with the number of qubits.

In more practical terms, existence of qLDPC codes would possibly facilitate the construction of quantum computers [Got14], as such codes would allow to stabilize a quantum-mechanical system using, say local magnetic fields, which are much easier to implement.

1.3 High-dimensional expanders

Expander graphs are graphs with a sparse adjacency matrix that are "rapidly-mixing" in a well-defined sense [Alo86, HLW06b]. Given the enormous success of expander graphs in computer science and combinatorics, it was natural to explore high-dimensional generalizations of expander graphs, namely, high-dimensional expanders. There is no de facto standard definition for high-dimensional expanders and in the last few years, the nascent research in this field has explored various definitions that are not known to be comparable. We survey here briefly the definitions that are most relevant to us and mention that more are available in the literature [LM06, KKL16, KL14, Par13, PRT16, EK16, Lub14]:

We begin with a definition of chain complexes, boundary maps, and homology (in our case, all linear maps are defined over $\mathbb{F}_2$):

Definition 4. ***Chain / co-chain complexes over*** $\mathbb{F}_2$
*A d-*dimensional chain complex *$\mathcal{X}$, or d-*complex*, is a tuple $(X_0, \ldots, X_d)$ of $d+1$ spaces over $\mathbb{F}_2$, with linear maps $\partial_i : X_i \to X_{i-1}$ for all $1 \leq i \leq d$, known as boundary maps, that satisfy the following boundary property:*

$$\partial_i \circ \partial_{i+1} = 0, \quad \forall i : 1 \leq i < d. \tag{3}$$

We define $Z_i := \ker(\partial_i)$, known as i-cycles, and $B_i := \mathrm{im}(\partial_{i+1})$, known as i-boundaries. According to Eq. (3), $B_i \subseteq Z_i$ for all i, so we can define the i-th homology as the quotient group (space) Z_i/B_i. We can

also define co-boundary maps as $\partial^i := \partial_i^\mathsf{T}$. *In this case,*

$$\partial^{i+1} \circ \partial^i = 0, \quad \forall i : 1 \leq i < d. \tag{4}$$

We define co-cycles and co-boundaries as $Z^i := \ker(\partial^{i+1})$ *and* $B^i := \mathrm{im}(\partial^i)$, *respectively, and hence* $B^i \subseteq Z^i$ *for all i. The i-th co-homology is then the quotient* Z^i / B^i.

Our working definition for expansion is a natural generalization of Cheeger's constant to hyper-graphs:

Definition 5. ***ε-pseudo-random complex***
Let $\mathcal{X}$ *be a d-dimensional complex on n vertices in which each* $(d-1)$*-cell has degree K. Denote the set of d-faces as E. For any* $S \subseteq [n]$ *a subset of the vertices, and for any* $j \leq d$, *define* $A(S, j)$ *to be the number of d-faces in E with j members in S. Then* $\mathcal{X}$ *is said to be* ε-pseudo-random *(ε-PR) if for all subsets of the vertices,* $S \subseteq [n]$ *we have:*

$$\left| \frac{A(S,j)}{|E|} - \binom{d}{j} \left(\frac{|S|}{n}\right)^j \left(1 - \frac{|S|}{n}\right)^{d-j} \right| < \varepsilon \tag{5}$$

Hence, a complex is ε-PR if the uniform distribution on its faces very nearly matches the uniform distribution over all faces of weight d, up to an additive error ε. The reader may note that the second term on the LHS is not really the probability that a uniformly chosen face of weight d has j vertices in S, but it is asymptotically close to this probability for large n and $d = O(1)$. Often, we will interpret the rows of ∂_d as a d-uniform hyper-graph and then say that ∂_d is ε-PR whenever $\mathcal{X}$ is ε-PR.

As a side note, our definition is very similar to the one defined in [PRT16], where a hyper-graph was said to be ε-PR if for any partition of V into $d+1$ parts the fraction of hyper-edges with one vertex in each part is the same as that fraction for a uniformly random d-hyper-edge, up to additive error ε. Under this definition, Parzanchevski then established an expander mixing lemma, showing that simplicial complexes with a large spectral gap (referring here to the Hodge Laplacian of simplicial complexes) are also ε-PR.
The second definition is due to [KKL16, EK16], and considers the $\mathbb{F}_2$ expansion of non-cycles:

Definition 6. ***Systole / co-systole***
Let $\mathcal{X}$ *be a d-complex with* $\mathbb{F}_2$ *boundary maps* $\partial_j : X_j \to X_{j-1}$ *for all* $0 < j \leq d$. *Let* $Z_j := \ker(\partial_j)$ *and* $B_j := \mathrm{im}(\partial_{j+1})$ *denote the j-cycles and j-boundaries. The j-*th systole *is then defined as:*

$$\mathrm{syst}_j(\mathcal{X}) := \min_{w \in Z_j - B_j} |w|.$$

*Likewise, the j-*th co-systole *is defined as:* $\min_{w \in Z^j - B^j} |w|$.

For cellulations of geometric manifolds, $\mathrm{syst}_1(\mathcal{X})$ can intuitively be understood as the length of a shortest non-trivial cycle.

Definition 7. ***Cycle / co-cycle expansion***
Let X be a d-complex with $\mathbb{F}_2$ *boundary maps* $\partial_j : X_j \to X_{j-1}$ *for all* $0 < j \leq d$. $\mathcal{X}$ *has* ε *j-*th cycle expansion *if*

$$\min_{x \in X_j - Z_j} \frac{|\partial_j x|}{\min_{w \in Z_j} |x + w|} \geq \varepsilon.$$

In [EK16] it is then shown that Ramanujan complexes have simultaneously ε co-cycle expansion, and a large (linear-size) co-systole. Hence these Ramanujan complexes are said to be co-systole expanders.

1.4 CSS codes: connecting quantum codes to high-dimensional expanders

CSS codes invented by Calderbank, Shor, and Steane (see [NC11] or the original papers [CS96, Ste96a, Ste96b]) are one of the earliest and most influential type of quantum codes. In fact, most quantum codes we know of to date are CSS codes. Arguably, their greatest advantage, is that they can be defined using pairs of *classical* codes, which then allows one to think of these quantum codes as classical codes with certain restrictions:

Definition 8. ***CSS code***
A quantum $[[n, k, d_{min}]]$ CSS code *is a pair of classical codes* $C_1, C_2 \subseteq \mathbb{F}_2^n$ *such that* $C_2 \subseteq C_1^\perp$ *and* $C_1 \subseteq C_2^\perp$. *The parameters of the code are given by* $k := \dim(C_1^\perp / C_2)$ *and*

$$d_{min} := \min_{w \in C_1^\perp - C_2, C_2^\perp - C_1} |w|.$$

The codes C_1 and C_2 describe the X and Z stabilizers of the codeword states, respectively. In the language of stabilizer quantum error correcting codes [NC11], we can specify a complete independent set of generators for the stabilizers by specifying a complete basis for the code spaces C_1 and C_2. If C_1 and C_2 are both m-dimensional classical codes, the resulting quantum code has $k = n - 2m$, since each independent stabilizer reduces the size of the code-space by a factor of 2.

Hence, to find a good quantum CSS code, we are required to find a pair of *classical* codes that contain the dual of each other, have a large quotient group (code rate), and a large value of d_{min} defined above. Furthermore, if we would like this CSS code to be sparse, it implies that each of C_1 and C_2 needs to be a LDPC code. While finding good classical LDPC codes is today an easy task, the extra condition of pairwise duality has prevented thus far any construction of good quantum LDPC codes in this way (i.e., via the CSS construction).

One of the many elegant features of CSS codes that has been recognized a long time ago, is that CSS codes naturally arise from chain complexes that are induced by a triangulation of a manifold. This has been the most common way of finding CSS codes [BMD07] for a while, perhaps the most prominent example of this being the well-known *toric code* due to Kitaev [Kit97], which is based on a 2-dimensional torus $\mathbb{Z}_n \times \mathbb{Z}_n$. This gives rise to a quantum code $\mathcal{C}[[n^2, 1, n]]$ whose distance scales as the square root of the number of physical qubits.

Assigning a CSS code to a triangulation of a manifold is in fact a special case of assigning it to 2-complex. Generally, for any d-complex $\mathcal{X}$, we can define a quantum CSS code on any sub-chain of length 3 as follows:

Definition 9. ***Map from 2-complexes to CSS codes***
Let $\mathcal{X} = (X_0, X_1, X_2)$ *be a 2-complex, with boundary maps* ∂_2, ∂_1. *The CSS code* $\mathcal{C}$ *corresponding to* X *is defined by choosing* $C_1 := \operatorname{im} \partial_1$, $C_2 := \operatorname{im} \partial_2^\mathsf{T}$, *and fixing* $\mathcal{C}(\mathcal{X}) = (C_1, C_2)$.

1.5 Discussion and previous work

In this work we have shown that high-dimensional complexes that are ε-pseudo-random have actually very poor quantum code distance. This implies that attempting to construct CSS codes in this way will probably not yield a construction of quantum qLDPC codes with linear distance. Furthermore, it implies that d-complexes that are ε-pseudo-random for small ε cannot be very good systole / co-systole expanders.

Our result is arguably surprising in the context of high-dimensional expanders: Evra and Kaufman recently showed [EK16] that certain high-dimensional Ramanujan complexes are good co-systole expanders. Together with our theorem, this implies a *lower bound* on the discrepancy ε of

these complexes. In contrast, the discrepancy ε of Ramanujan *graphs* can be made arbitrarily low (i.e. $2/\sqrt{K}$ for K-regular graphs). Stepping back, our result is thus an example where the quantum perspective sheds light on questions in other fields.

In the context of quantum codes, there are no-go results for quantum codes that can be embedded into lattices. In particular Bravyi et al. [BT09, BPT10] have shown that stabilizer codes that can be embedded into D-dimensional lattices where $D = O(1)$, and each stabilizer is supported on $O(1)$ qubits within some hyper-cube, cannot have linear distance. Our result can be viewed as the "other end" of this limit. We show that codes which are in a sense "strongly" not embeddable into a lattice also have small distance, although we show only small linear distance and not sub-linear distance. We note that if qLDPC is true, it must be somewhere between these two extreme limits.

Interestingly, under a certain conjecture in high-dimensional geometry, Hastings [Has16] recently showed a quantum CSS code with distance $n^{1-\varepsilon}$, for arbitrarily small $\varepsilon > 0$, whose parity check matrices have sparsity $\log(n)$, using a cellulation of a family of random lattices, called LDA. Given the inherent embedding in a lattice, we believe that the 2-complex of his code would actually be very far from pseudo-random. This suggests that perhaps the "right" way to resolve the qLDPC conjecture is to look for high-dimensional manifolds that avoid pseudo-randomness.

Perhaps more fundamentally, our work suggests that quantum multi-particle entanglement may be inherently limited on random-looking topologies, contrasting the fact that random-looking topologies are considered to be "robust". Interestingly enough, the notion that highly-expanding topologies are adversarial to large-scale quantum entanglement resonates with a sequence of results of a somewhat different context: In [BH13] the authors show that the ground-states of 2-local Hamiltonians whose graph is *expanding* can be approximated by tensor-product states. A similar result in [AE15] shows this for k-local commuting Hamiltonians with a bipartite form of expansion, using a more stringent criterion called *local expansion*.

1.6 Overview of the proof

Our main statement considers a 2-complex $\mathcal{X} = (X_0, X_1, X_2)$, with boundary operators ∂_1, ∂_2 such that $\mathcal{X}$ is ε-pseudo-random, for some small $\varepsilon > 0$. We begin by defining a linear space $C \subseteq \mathbb{F}_2^n$ to be *weakly-binomial* if its weight enumerator $(B_0, \ldots, B_n)$ - i.e. the vector of $n+1$ bins, specifying the number of words of C in any given weight - this enumerator has an upper-bound that behaves like the binomial distribution:

Definition 10. ***Weakly-binomial subspace***
A subspace $C \subseteq \mathbb{F}_2^n$ on n bits is (ζ, η)-weakly-binomial *if for some constants $\zeta > 0$ and $\eta > 0$ we have:*

$$\forall k \in \{0, \ldots, n\}, \quad B_k \leq \frac{2^{\zeta n}\binom{n}{k}}{|C^\perp|} + 2^{\eta n}, \tag{6}$$

where $\{B_k\}$ is the weight enumerator of C and $|C^\perp|$ is the size of the dual space of C.

Note that the normalization by $|C^\perp|$ is necessary, by setting $\zeta = \eta = 0$. Our proof consists of two main steps:

1. We show that the subspace $C \subseteq \mathbb{F}_2^n$ spanned by the generators (hyper-edges) of an ε-pseudorandom complex is weakly-binomial.

2. We show that any weakly-binomial subspace C, for which the dual code $C^\perp$ also *contains* a LDPC code, must have a relatively large dimension.

This second statement implies that a CSS code $\mathcal{C} = (C_1, C_2)$ corresponding to ε-PR boundaries, then the relative dimension of each of C_1, C_2 is very close to $1/2$. By standard distance-rate trade-offs in quantum error-correction this then implies an upper-bound on the minimal quantum error-correcting distance of $\mathcal{C}$.

1.6.1 An ε-PR hyper-graph spans a weakly-binomial subspace

In the first step, we would like to approximate the weight enumerator of a space C spanned by a set of generators that satisfy the pseudorandom condition in Definition 5. The weight enumerator is approximated by considering a random walk $\mathcal{M}_1$ on the Cayley graph of the space C using its set of LDPC-sparse, and ε-pseudorandom set of generators. The stationary distribution of $\mathcal{M}$, when summed-up over separate shells of $\mathbb{F}_2^n$ of fixed-weight then provide exactly the weight enumerator.

We would hence like to "project"-down $\mathcal{M}_1$ to a random walk $\mathcal{M}_2$ defined on $n+1$ nodes corresponding to "shells" of fixed weight in $\mathbb{F}_2^n$. Hence, we would like to define transition probabilities between "weight-bins" that are independent of which word we choose in a fixed-weight bin. To do this, we define a coarse-graining of the chain over some fixed partition of the outcome space. We choose the shells of fixed weight as the sets in our partition.

So now, consider the line walk $\mathcal{M}_2$: it is comprised of $n+1$ bins, with non-zero transition probabilities between nodes of distance at most q - the locality of the generators. We consider a bin B_k - i.e. the set of words in C of weight k, and ask: suppose that we sample a uniformly random generator g from the rows of ∂_2 and add it to $w \in B_k$: what is the distribution of $|w+g|$?

Generically - this might be a hard problem to solve. However, using the ε-PR condition it becomes simpler: this condition, when interpreted in the appropriate way, tells us that the probability that $|w+g| = k+j$, where $j \leq q$, and q is the locality of each generator - behaves approximately like sampling a word of weight q *uniformly at random* and adding it to w. As a result, this implies that $\mathcal{M}_2$ assumes the form of a binomial chain, i.e. adding uniformly random words of weight q, up to an *additive* error at most ε. We then analyze this chain, and show it implies that the stationary distribution of this perturbed chain deviates from the pure unperturbed chain by a modest multiplicative exponential error, so long as the bins we consider are "close" to the center $n/2$. Far from the center bin $B_{n/2}$ we have no control - but this is translated to a small exponential additive error - which together implies weak binomiality.

1.6.2 Weakly-binomial subspaces with LDPC duals have large dimension

In this part of the proof we are given a subspace C, such that $C^\perp$ contains an LDPC code, and C is weakly binomial. We think of C as being the span of parity checks $C = C_1 = S_x$ of a CSS code, and hence $C^\perp$ *contains* also the space spanned by a set of LDPC parity checks $C_2 = S_z$. We assume that the boundary operators are d-local, and each bit is incident on K (Pauli x) checks, for $d, K = O(1)$.

To place a lower-bound on the dimension of C we invoke the Sloane Mac-Williams transform [MS77] which translates any weight enumerator on a code C, to the weight enumerator on the dual code $C^\perp$. The *crux* of the argument is essentially a weak converse to previous results by Ashikhmin and Litsyn [AL99] which use the transform in the context of classical codes.

Consider for example a classical code of large distance. It's weight enumerator $(B_0, \ldots, B_n)$ is by definition such that $B_0 = 1$ (the zero word) and $B_i = 0$ for all $0 < i < \delta_{min}$. The result by Ashikhmin and Litsyn show that if this is the case, then the weight enumerator of the dual code $(B_0^\perp, \ldots, B_n^\perp)$ has an upper-bound that is very close to being binomial: if one considers an interval

of linear size around $n/2$, say $[n/3, \ldots, n/2, \ldots, 2n/3]$ then it is the case that each B_k is at most $\binom{n}{k}/|C|$ up to a multiplicative polynomial factor.

In our case, we consider a *quantum* code, namely a CSS code, and argue the opposite way: we show that if the weight enumerator (of one of the corresponding classical codes) $(B_0, \ldots, B_n)$ is *weakly* binomial in the sense defined above, then the weight enumerator of the dual $(B_0^\perp, \ldots, B_n^\perp)$ does not have a precise prefix of 0 bins, as in the classical case of a large-distance code, but the first αn bins are still very small, for some constant $\alpha > 0$.

On the other hand, and this happens only for the quantum case: we know that the dual code $C^\perp$ contains an LDPC code. Any LDPC code - whether it is ε-PR or not, has the property that in the appropriate scale, the number of words in bin B_k grows exponentially fast with k, at least for sufficiently small $k = \beta n$.

So together, we collide on the bins of the dual code the opposing forces of the upper-bound implied by the weak binomial distribution, which implies that the lower-prefix of $B^\perp$ is very small, with the fact that this lower-prefix blows-up exponentially fast because it contains an LDPC code. This implies a stringent limit on the dimension of the parity check spaces - and hence a lower-bound on the rate of the code, which in turn implies a stringent upper-bound on its minimal distance of the corresponding quantum code.

2 Preliminaries

2.1 Notation

We adopt the following conventions and notation throughout the paper. Even though some of the machinery we use (e.g. MacWilliams identity) hold in a more general setting, we restrict our attention to binary linear codes in the classical case and binary (qubit) codes based on the CSS construction in the quantum case. Consequently, all linear operators in this paper are over $\mathbb{F}_2$. We denote a binary quantum code that encodes k qubits into n qubits with distance d_{min} as $[[n, k, d_{min}]]$. Similarly, a classical code that encodes k bits into n bits and has distance d_{min} will be denoted $[n, k, d_{min}]$. We will write $\rho := k/n$ for the *rate* of a code, classical or quantum, and $\delta_{min} := d_{min}/n$ for the *error rate* of a code.

A chain complex will be denoted by a calligraphic capital letter while the underlying spaces by the Roman shape of the same letter. For instance, a 2-complex will be denoted as $\mathcal{X} = (X_0, X_1, X_2)$ where X_i are linear spaces over $\mathbb{F}_2$ with X_0 corresponding to formal linear combinations of vertices, X_1 of edges, and X_2 of faces. We denote the boundary operators by $\partial_i : X_i \to X_{i-1}$ and the co-boundary operators by $\partial^i : X_i \to X_{i+1}$.

We will use d to denote the largest size of a hyper-edge in a complex. Alternatively, for a code over $\mathbb{F}_2$ the parameter d (not to be confused with the distance d_{min}) represents the Hamming weight of its parity checks in the basis of minimal Hamming weight. The letter K will be used to denote the degree of a vertex, i.e. it will denote the number of $(d-1)$-cells incident to each d cell or, alternatively, the number of bits examined by each parity check. For $x \in \mathbb{F}_2^n$, $|x|$ denotes the Hamming weight of x. Finally, we define $\log(x) \equiv \log_2(x)$ and use $H(p) := -p \log p - (1-p)\log(1-p)$ to denote the *binary entropy function*.

For a discrete set E we use the notation $x \sim U[E]$ to denote that x is a uniformly random element from E.

Definition 11. *Let $g(n)$ and $h(n)$ be two functions of n. We write $g(n) \geq_p h(n)$ if, for all $n \geq 1$,*

$$g(n) \geq h(n) n^z \tag{7}$$

for some constant z. Similarly, we write $g(n) \leq_p h(n)$ if, for all $n \geq 1$,

$$g(n) \leq h(n)n^z. \tag{8}$$

2.2 Kravchuk polynomials

Kravchuk polynomials are a special set of orthogonal polynomials with many applications in error correction [MS77, p. 130]. They have a simple interpretation which makes their definition and many of their properties intuitive.

We fix n to be some positive integer throughout. Let $m \in \{0, \ldots, n\}$ and denote by

$$S_m := \{w \in \mathbb{F}_2^n : |w| = m\} \tag{9}$$

the set of all length-n strings of Hamming weight m. Let $\chi_u : \mathbb{F}_2^n \to \{-1, +1\}$ be a character of $\mathbb{F}_2^n$ for some $u \in \mathbb{F}_2^n$, i.e. a function of the form $\chi_u(v) := (-1)^{u \cdot v}$ where $u \cdot v := \sum_{i=1}^n u_i v_i$ denotes the inner product modulo 2. The m-th Kravchuk polynomial evaluated at $x \in \{0, \ldots, n\}$ is then defined as

$$P_m(x) := \sum_{w \in S_m} \chi_u(w) = \sum_{w \in S_m} (-1)^{u \cdot w}, \tag{10}$$

where $u \in \mathbb{F}_2^n$ is any vector of Hamming weight $|u| = x$. Note by symmetry that $P_m(x)$ does not depend on the word u chosen as long as $|u| = x$. Also note that $P_m(x)$ implicitly depends also on the dimension n of the underlying space $\mathbb{F}_2^n$, which should be clear from the context.

For any integer $l \geq 0$ and formal variable x, we define the *binomial coefficient* as the following degree-l polynomial in x:

$$\binom{x}{l} := \frac{x(x-1)\cdots(x-l+1)}{l!}. \tag{11}$$

For integers $l < 0$ the the binomial coefficient is taken to be zero. Using this, Kravchuk polynomials can be written explicitly as follows:

Definition 12. *The m-th* Kravchuk polynomial, *for $m \in \{0, \ldots, n\}$, is a degree-m polynomial in $x \in \mathbb{R}$ given by*

$$P_m(x) := \sum_{l=0}^{m} (-1)^l \binom{x}{l} \binom{n-x}{m-l}. \tag{12}$$

It is not hard to see that Eqs. (10) and (12) agree for integer values of x.

One of the most important properties of Kravchuk polynomials is that they are orthogonal under a particular inner product. This fact that can be easily verified using the above interpretation:

Lemma 13. *For $i, j \in \{0, \ldots, n\}$, the Kravchuk polynomials $P_i(k)$ and $P_j(k)$ satisfy*

$$\sum_{k=0}^{n} \binom{n}{k} P_i(k) P_j(k) = \delta_{ij} 2^n \binom{n}{i} \tag{13}$$

where δ_{ij} is the Kronecker delta.

Proof. For each $k \in \{0, \ldots, n\}$, let $u \in \mathbb{F}_2^n$ be some word of weight k. Then, by Eq. (10),

$$\sum_{k=0}^{n} \binom{n}{k} P_i(k) P_j(k) = \sum_{k=0}^{n} \binom{n}{k} \sum_{w \in S_i} (-1)^{u \cdot w} \sum_{w' \in S_j} (-1)^{u \cdot w'}. \tag{14}$$

Since we could have chosen any other word u' of the same weight,

$$\sum_{w\in S_i}(-1)^{u\cdot w}\sum_{w'\in S_j}(-1)^{u\cdot w'}=\sum_{w\in S_i}(-1)^{u'\cdot w}\sum_{w'\in S_j}(-1)^{u'\cdot w'}, \tag{15}$$

so we can rewrite the right-hand side of Eq. (14) as:

$$\sum_{k=0}^{n}\sum_{x\in S_k}\sum_{\substack{w\in S_i\\ w'\in S_j}}(-1)^{x\cdot(w+w')}. \tag{16}$$

Now group the first two sums together and interchange the order of summation:

$$\sum_{\substack{w\in S_i\\ w'\in S_j}}\sum_{x\in\mathbb{F}_2^n}(-1)^{x\cdot(w+w')}. \tag{17}$$

If $w+w'\neq 0$, the internal sum vanishes. If $i\neq j$ then $w+w'$ is never 0, so the whole expression vanishes. If $i=j$ then for every $w\in S_i$ there is exactly one word $w'\in S_j$ with $w+w'=0$, so in this case the sum is $\binom{n}{i}2^n$. □

One important application of this orthogonality relation is that any polynomial $g(x)$ with $\deg(g)\leq n$ has a unique Kravchuk decomposition. A simple way of determining such a decomposition is as follows:

Fact 14. *If $g(x)$ is a polynomial of degree at most n, its Kravchuk decomposition is*

$$g(x)=\sum_{j=0}^{n}g_jP_j(x)\qquad \textit{where}\qquad g_j:=\frac{1}{2^n\binom{n}{j}}\sum_{k=0}^{n}\binom{n}{k}P_j(k)g(k). \tag{18}$$

Following the line of argument in [KL97], we will make use of a particular decomposition for the polynomial $P_m(x)^2$:

Lemma 15. *For any $m\in\{0,\ldots,\lfloor n/2\rfloor\}$,*

$$(P_m(x))^2=\sum_{i=0}^{m}\binom{2i}{i}\binom{n-2i}{m-i}P_{2i}(x). \tag{19}$$

Proof. According to Eq. (10),

$$(P_m(x))^2=\sum_{w,w'\in S_m}(-1)^{u\cdot(w+w')} \tag{20}$$

for any $u\in\mathbb{F}_2^n$ such that $|u|=x$. Note that $|w+w'|=2i$ for some $i\in\{0,\ldots,m\}$, so we can rewrite the right-hand side of Eq. (20) as

$$\sum_{i=0}^{m}\sum_{v\in S_{2i}}c_v(-1)^{u\cdot v}, \tag{21}$$

where the integer c_v accounts for the number of ways two n-bit strings w and w' (each of Hamming weight m) can overlap to produce a given string $v=w+w'$ of weight $|v|=2i$. It is not hard to see that c_v depends only on the Hamming weight of v and is given by

$$c_v=\binom{2i}{i}\binom{n-2i}{m-i}. \tag{22}$$

Indeed, we simply need to account for all ways of splitting the $2i$ ones of v into two groups of size i each (one of the groups is contributed by w while the other by w') as well as picking $m-i$ out of the remaining $n-2i$ locations where the remaining $m-i$ ones of w and w' would cancel out. □

We will also need the following simple upper bound on Kravchuk polynomials:

Lemma 16. *For any $k \in \{0, \ldots, n\}$,*

$$P_m(k) \leq \binom{n}{m}. \tag{23}$$

Proof. This follows easily from Eq. (10). Let u be any binary vector with $|u| = k$. Then

$$P_m(k) = \sum_{w \in S_m} (-1)^{u \cdot w} \leq \sum_{w \in S_m} (1)^{u \cdot w} = \binom{n}{m} \tag{24}$$

as claimed. □

2.3 The Sloane-MacWilliams transform

We will use an important relation known as MacWilliams identity [MS77]. Suppose we have some linear code C in $\mathbb{F}_2^n$. We define the weight enumerator of the code C as a set of coefficients $\{B_k\}$ where each B_k denotes the number of words of weight k in the code. The dual code is simply the code $C^\perp$, all the words in $\mathbb{F}_2^n$ that are orthogonal to all the words in C. Of course the code $C^\perp$ has its own weight enumerator $\{B_k^\perp\}$. We state these notions formally in the following definitions:

Definition 17. *Given a code C, and for all $k \in \{0, \ldots, n\}$, we define the weight enumerator B_k as:*

$$B_k = |\{x \in C : |x| = k\}| \tag{25}$$

We define the dual code:

Definition 18. *Given a code C, we define the dual code $C^\perp$ as:*

$$C^\perp = \{x \in \mathbb{F}_2^n : \forall c \in C,\, c \cdot x = 0\} \tag{26}$$

Naturally the dual code has an analogously defined weight enumerator:

Definition 19. *For a code C and $C^\perp$, we define:*

$$B_k^\perp = |\{x \in C^\perp : |x| = k\} \tag{27}$$

The MacWilliams identity provides a way to write the weight enumerator of the dual code in terms of the weight enumerator of $\mathcal{C}$, and the Kravchuk polynomials.

Theorem 20 ([MS77])**.** *Let $\mathcal{C}$ be a linear code over $\mathbb{F}_2^n$ with weight enumerator $\{B_k\}$. Denote the dual code $\mathcal{C}^\perp$ and its weight enumerator $\{B_k^\perp\}$. Then, it holds that:*

$$B_k^\perp = \frac{1}{|\mathcal{C}|} \sum_{j=0}^{n} P_k(j) B_j \tag{28}$$

where $|\mathcal{C}|$ denotes the number of codewords in $\mathcal{C}$.

There are several different ways in which MacWilliams is applied to study the parameters of codes (classical and quantum). One common way to apply the transform is to define a linear program on the weight enumerator of the code [MS77]. Since $B_k^\perp \geq 0$, this provides a non-trivial constraint in the program. Using standard ideas in linear programming, the dual program provides simple bounds on the original (also referred to as the *primal*) problem, and therefore on the resulting code. Any feasible solution in the dual program provides a bound on the original program [MS77]. We will only require a simple identity based on the MacWilliams transform:

Lemma 21 ([KL97]). *Let $\{B_j\}$ be the weight enumerator of a code $\mathcal{C}$ on n bits, and $\{B_j^\perp\}$ be the weight enumerator of its dual. If $\alpha(x) := \sum_{j=0}^n \alpha_j P_j(x)$ for some coefficients α_j, then*

$$|C| \sum_{j=0}^n \alpha_j B_j^\perp = \sum_{j=0}^n \alpha(j) B_j. \tag{29}$$

Proof. By the MacWilliams identity,

$$\sum_{j=0}^n \alpha_j B_j^\perp = \sum_{j=0}^n \alpha_j \left[\frac{1}{|C|} \sum_{k=0}^n B_k P_j(k) \right] = \frac{1}{|C|} \sum_{k=0}^n B_k \sum_{j=0}^n \alpha_j P_j(k) = \frac{1}{|C|} \sum_{j=0}^n B_j \alpha(j). \tag{30}$$

□

For obvious reasons, this identity has many applications in error correction. In particular it is a useful tool for establishing many bounds on quantum codes. One such bound, which we will need in the proof of the main theorem, is provided by Ashikhmin and Litsyn:

Proposition 22 ([AL99, Corollary 2]). *A quantum code with parameters $[[n, k, d_{min}]]$ satisfies:*

$$\frac{k}{n} \leq 1 - \frac{\delta_{min}}{2} \log(3) - H\left(\frac{\delta_{min}}{2}\right) - o(1), \tag{31}$$

2.4 Markov chains

We will use coarse-grained Markov chains in our analysis. We wish to partition the discrete state space of a Markov chain and analyze the coarse-grained dynamics. Given a Markov chain $\mathcal{M}$ with state space Ω, and some subset $A \subseteq \Omega$, for any probability distribution π over Ω we will denote:

$$\pi_A := \sum_{i \in A} \pi_i \tag{32}$$

We then define a coarse-graining of a Markov chain:

Definition 23. ***Coarse-grained Markov chain***
Let $\mathcal{M}$ be an irreducible Markov chain with state space Ω. Denote the probability of transitioning from i to j as $\mathcal{M}_{i,j}$. Suppose we have a partition $\{S_k\}$ of Ω (i.e. $\cup_k S_k = \Omega$ and $S_k \cap S_j = \emptyset$ for $k \neq j$). Denote the Markov chain's stationary distribution by $\{\pi_j\}$. We denote the coarse-grained Markov chain with respect to $\{S_k\}$ and π by $\mathcal{M}'$. It has exactly one state for each set in $\{S_i\}$. If A and B are two sets in $\{S_i\}$ we define:

$$\mathcal{M}'_{A,B} = \sum_{i \in A} \sum_{j \in B} \frac{\pi_i}{\pi_A} \mathcal{M}_{i,j}. \tag{33}$$

Lemma 24. ***Stationary distributions of coarse-grained chains are coarse-grained stationary distributions***
Let $\mathcal{M}$ be an irreducible Markov chain with stationary distribution $\{\pi_j\}$, and suppose we have some partition of the state space $\{S_i\}$. Suppose we construct the coarse-grained Markov chain $\mathcal{M}'$ with respect to the partition $\{S_i\}$. Denote the stationary distribution of $\mathcal{M}'$ as $\{\pi'_{S_i}\}$. The stationary distribution of $\mathcal{M}'$satisfies:

$$\forall S_i \in \{S_i\} \quad \pi'_{S_i} = \pi_{S_i} = \sum_{j \in S_i} \pi_j \tag{34}$$

Proof. Fix some $B \in \{S_i\}$, we can evaluate:

$$\sum_{S_i} \pi_{S_i} \mathcal{M}'_{S_i,B} = \sum_{S_i} \pi_{S_i} \sum_{j \in S_i} \sum_{k \in B} \frac{\pi_j}{\pi_{S_i}} \mathcal{M}_{j,k} \tag{35}$$

$$= \sum_{S_i} \sum_{j \in S_i} \sum_{k \in B} \pi_j \mathcal{M}_{j,k} = \sum_{j \in \Omega} \sum_{k \in B} \pi_j \mathcal{M}_{j,k} = \sum_{k \in B} \sum_{j \in \Omega} \pi_j \mathcal{M}_{j,k} \tag{36}$$

Since $\{\pi_j\}$ is stationary for the original chain, then

$$= \sum_{k \in B} \pi_k = \pi_B \tag{37}$$

So, the distribution $\{\pi_{S_i}\}$ is stationary for the coarse-grained chain $\mathcal{M}'$. □

Definition 25. ***Reversible Markov chains***
Let $\mathcal{M}$ be a Markov chain on space Ω with stationary distribution π. $\mathcal{M}$ is said to be reversible if

$$\forall i, j \in \Omega, \quad \pi_i \mathcal{M}_{i,j} = \pi_j \mathcal{M}_{j,i}$$

The following fact is standard: it says that the random walk on the Cayley graph of a finite group is reversible. This follows almost immediately from the fact that this walk is invariant under left multiplication by an element of the group:

Fact 26. ***Walks on finite Cayley graphs are reversible***
Let G be a group, and $\mathcal{G}(G, s)$ be the Cayley graph of G w.r.t. some generating set $s \subseteq G$. Let $\mathcal{M}$ denote the random walk on $\mathcal{G}$. Then $\mathcal{M}$ is reversible.

Next, we show that under our natural definition of coarse-graining, reversible chains remain reversible:

Fact 27. ***Coarse-grained reversible chains are reversible***
Let $\mathcal{M}$ be a reversible Markov chain on space Ω, with a stationary distribution π. Let $\{S_k\}$ be some partition of Ω. Then the coarse-grained chain $\mathcal{M}'(\{S_k\}, \pi)$ is reversible.

Proof. Let $\mathcal{M}$ be a reversible Markov chain. By definition, then,

$$\pi_i \mathcal{M}_{i,j} = \pi_j \mathcal{M}_{j,i} \tag{38}$$

We can write:

$$\pi_{S_i} \mathcal{M}_{S_i,S_j} = \pi_{S_i} \sum_{k_1 \in S_i} \sum_{k_2 \in S_j} \frac{\pi_{k_1}}{\pi_{S_i}} \mathcal{M}_{k_1,k_2} \tag{39}$$

$$= \sum_{k_1 \in S_i} \sum_{k_2 \in S_j} \pi_{k_1} \mathcal{M}_{k_1,k_2} \tag{40}$$

by reversibility,

$$= \sum_{k_1 \in S_i} \sum_{k_2 \in S_j} \pi_{k_2} \mathcal{M}_{k_2,k_1} = \pi_{S_j} \mathcal{M}_{S_j,S_i} \tag{41}$$

□

3 An ε-PR complex spans a weakly-binomial subspace

The goal of this section is to show that any degree-regular chain complex that is ε-PR yields a set of stabilizers that span a weakly-binomial space. The main lemma of this section shows that ε-pseudo-randomness (see Definition 5) implies weak binomiality:

Lemma 28. ***ε-PR hyper-edges span weakly-binomial space***
Let $G = (V, E)$ be a d-uniform hyper-graph, i.e. $E \subseteq \binom{n}{d}$ - subsets of vertices of V of size exactly d, where $deg(v) = K$ for each $v \in V$. If G is ε-pseudorandom (ε-PR), then the span of E as words over $\mathbb{F}_2^n$ is (ζ, η) weakly binomial with constants $\zeta = \varepsilon^{1/2}$ and $\eta = H(\varepsilon^{1/(2d)})$.

We note that despite assumption that each vertex has a small, constant degree K, the parameters of the weakly-binomial property do not depend on this value K. This is crucial since typically ε cannot scale better than $2/\sqrt{K}$ - as in the case of Ramanujan graphs [Alo86, Lub14].

3.1 Weight enumerators as stationary distributions

We analyze the weight enumerator of ε-PR complexes by associating them to natural Markov chains, and then analyzing the stationary distributions of these Markov chains.

Definition 29. *Let $G = (V, E)$ be a hyper-graph $|V| = n$, and let $\mathcal{C} \subseteq \mathbb{F}_2^n$ be the space spanned by the hyper edges of G as vectors over $\mathbb{F}_2^n$. We associate a pair of Markov chains to $\mathcal{C}$: $\mathcal{M}^1, \mathcal{M}^2$ as follows:*

- *$\mathcal{M}^1$ is the Markov chain defined by a random walk on to the Cayley graph of $\mathcal{C}$ using the set of generators E.*
- *Let S_i be the set of words in $\mathcal{C}$ of weight i, formally defined as $S_i = \{x \in \mathcal{C} \mid |x| = i\}$. $\mathcal{M}^2$ is defined as the coarse-grained Markov chain with respect to the partition $\{S_i\}$, and some stationary distribution of $\mathcal{M}^1$.*

Let us denote the Markov chains corresponding to the complete hyper-graph as $\mathcal{M}^1$ and $\mathcal{M}^2$ (in this case E contains all words of weight d). Denote the corresponding stationary distributions as π^1 and π^2. Similarly, let us denote the Markov chains corresponding to our ε-pseudorandom complex as $\mathcal{M}^{1,\varepsilon}$ and $\mathcal{M}^{2,\varepsilon}$ and the corresponding stationary distributions as $\pi^{1,\varepsilon}$ and $\pi^{2,\varepsilon}$. The main observation is that to understand the weight enumerator of $\mathcal{C} = span(E)$ for our ε-pseudorandom complex, one can instead look at the 1-dimensional stationary distributions $\pi^{2,\varepsilon}$ of $\mathcal{M}^{2,\varepsilon}$. It is easy to check that

$$\forall k \in [n], \quad B_k = 2^m \pi_k^{2,\varepsilon}. \tag{42}$$

So now, if a d-uniform hyper-graph G is ε-pseudorandom we would like to characterize its corresponding $\mathcal{M}^{1,\varepsilon}, \mathcal{M}^{2,\varepsilon}$ Markov chains as an approximation of the Markov chains $\mathcal{M}^1$ and $\mathcal{M}^2$.

Proposition 30. ***ε-PR chains project down to approximately independent chains***
Let $G = (V, E)$, $|V| = n$, be a d-uniform hyper-graph which is ε-PR. Then we have in $\mathcal{M}^{2,\varepsilon}$ the following transition probabilities for all $i \in [n]$:

$$\forall j \leq d, \quad \left| \mathcal{M}^{2,\varepsilon}_{i,i+d-2j} - \binom{d}{j} (i/n)^j (1 - i/n)^{d-j} \right| \leq \varepsilon. \tag{43}$$

Proof. Let $\pi^{1,\varepsilon}$ denote the stationary distribution of $\mathcal{M}^{1,\varepsilon}$. Consider some $x \in S_i \subseteq \mathbb{F}_2^n$ and define $A \subseteq [n]$ as the subset of bits for which $x(i) = 1$. Let us choose S in Definition 5 as A. By the ε-pseudorandom condition, the probability that $x + y \in S_{i+d-2j}$ where $y \sim U[E]$ is a value in the following interval

$$\mathcal{T}(i,j) = \left[\binom{d}{j} \left(\frac{i}{n}\right)^j \left(1 - \frac{i}{n}\right)^{d-j} - \varepsilon, \binom{d}{j} \left(\frac{i}{n}\right)^j \left(1 - \frac{i}{n}\right)^{d-j} + \varepsilon \right]$$

The Markov chain $\mathcal{M}^{2,\varepsilon}$ is derived by a coarse-graining of $\mathcal{M}^{1,\varepsilon}$ along shells S_i with coefficients from $\pi^{1,\varepsilon}$. Hence, by definition of coarse-graining Definition 23 the transition probability in $\mathcal{M}^{2,\varepsilon}$ between vertices i and $i + d - 2j$ is a convex combination of probability values in $\mathcal{T}(i,j)$. Hence $\mathcal{M}^{2,\varepsilon}_{i,i+d-2j} \in \mathcal{T}(i,j)$ as required.

□

We note that when $\mathcal{M}^1$ is the Markov chain corresponding to the span of *all* generators of weight d we have that the stationary distribution of its 1-dimensional corresponding chain $\mathcal{M}^2$, π^2 satisfies

$$\forall k \in [n], \quad \pi^2_k = 2^{-n} \binom{n}{k}. \tag{44}$$

3.2 Stationary distributions

Having established that the transition probabilities of $\mathcal{M}^{2,\varepsilon}$ are very close to the transition probabilities of $\mathcal{M}^2$, we prove that the stationary distribution π^2 is an upper bound on $\pi^{2,\varepsilon}$, up to a modest exponential factor.

Proposition 31. *Let $\mathcal{M}^1$ be the Markov chain corresponding to the random walk on $\mathbb{F}_2^n$ using all words of weight d. Let $\mathcal{M}^{1,\varepsilon}$ denote the Markov chain corresponding to the random walk on $\mathbb{F}_2^n$ using E. Let $\mathcal{I}$ denote the interval $[n\varepsilon^{1/(2d)}, n(1-\varepsilon^{1/(2d)})]$. Let π^1 and $\pi^{1,\varepsilon}$ denote the stationary distributions of $\mathcal{M}^1$ and $\mathcal{M}^{1,\varepsilon}$, respectively. Let $\mathcal{M}^2, \mathcal{M}^{2,\varepsilon}$ denote the coarse-graining of $\mathcal{M}^1, \mathcal{M}^{1,\varepsilon}$, to the $n+1$ shells $\{S_k\}_{k=0}^n$ using the stationary distributions $\pi^1, \pi^{1,\varepsilon}$ respectively. Let $\pi^2, \pi^{2,\varepsilon}$ denote their corresponding stationary distributions. Then*

$$\forall i \in \mathcal{I}, \quad \pi^{2,\varepsilon}_i \leq \pi^2_i \cdot 2^{2\varepsilon^{1/2}(n/2-i)}.$$

Proof. Since both $\mathcal{M}^1, \mathcal{M}^{1,\varepsilon}$ are random walks on finite Cayley graphs then by Fact 26 they are reversible. Hence by Fact 27 the coarse-grained Markov chains $\mathcal{M}^1(\{S_k\}, \pi^1), \mathcal{M}^{1,\varepsilon}_1(\{S_k\}, \pi^{1,\varepsilon})$ are also reversible. This implies

$$\forall i \in [n],\ \mathcal{M}^2_{i,i+1}\pi^2_i = \mathcal{M}^2_{i+1,i}\pi^2_{i+1}. \tag{45}$$

$$\forall i \in [n],\ \mathcal{M}^{2,\varepsilon}_{i,i+1}\pi^{2,\varepsilon}_i = \mathcal{M}^{2,\varepsilon}_{i+1,i}\pi^{2,\varepsilon}_{i+1}. \tag{46}$$

By definition of the interval $\mathcal{I}$ and by Definition 5, any transition probability is lower bounded by $(\varepsilon^{1/(2d)})^d = \varepsilon^{1/2}$ over $|j| \leq d$. Hence:

$$\forall i \in \mathcal{I}, j \leq d,\ \ \mathcal{M}^{2,}_{i,i+j} \geq \varepsilon^{1/2}. \tag{47}$$

Therefore by Definition 5

$$\forall i \in \mathcal{I}, |j| \leq d\ \mathcal{M}^{2,\varepsilon}_{i,i+j} \leq \mathcal{M}^2_{i,i+j} \cdot (1 + \varepsilon^{1/2}). \tag{48}$$

Together with Equations 45,46 above this implies

$$\forall i \in \mathcal{I}, \quad \frac{\pi_i^{2,\varepsilon}}{\pi_{i+1}^{2,\varepsilon}} \leq \frac{\pi_i^2}{\pi_{i+1}^2} \cdot \frac{1+\varepsilon^{1/2}}{1-\varepsilon^{1/2}} \leq \frac{\pi_i^2}{\pi_{i+1}^2} \cdot (1+2\varepsilon^{1/2}), \tag{49}$$

where the last inequality follows from Taylor series expansion. Thus,

$$\frac{\pi_i^{2,\varepsilon}}{\pi_{i+1}^{2,\varepsilon}} \cdot \ldots \cdot \frac{\pi_{n/2-1}^{2,\varepsilon}}{\pi_{n/2}^{2,\varepsilon}} \leq \frac{\pi_i^2}{\pi_{i+1}^2} \cdot \ldots \cdot \frac{\pi_{n/2-1}^2}{\pi_{n/2}^2} \cdot (1+2\varepsilon^{1/2})^{(n/2-i)}. \tag{50}$$

In addition, by monotonicity of the binomial distribution around $n/2$, we have that $\pi_{n/2}^2 \geq n^{-k}$, for some constant $k > 0$. Hence

$$\forall i \in \mathcal{I}, \quad \pi_i^{2,\varepsilon} \leq 2^{2\varepsilon^{1/2}(n/2-i)} n^k \pi_i^2. \tag{51}$$

□

3.3 Proof of Lemma 28

To describe briefly the proof of the lemma: Let $\mathcal{M}^1$ be the random walk using all words of weight d, and let $\mathcal{M}^{1,\varepsilon}$ be the random walk using generators E. In general, the stationary distribution $\pi^{1,\varepsilon}$ of the n-dimensional Markov chain $\mathcal{M}^{1,\varepsilon}$ can very hard to analyze. However, since we are only interested in the coarse graining of this distribution into $n+1$ fixed-weight Hamming shells $\pi^{2,\varepsilon}$ - namely the weight enumerator of $\mathcal{C} = \mathrm{span}(E)$, we can consider instead the coarse-grained Markov chain $\mathcal{M}^{2,\varepsilon}$ - which is the coarse-graining of $\mathcal{M}^{1,\varepsilon}$ using $\pi^{1,\varepsilon}$. This greatly simplifies the analysis in two senses: On one hand - $\mathcal{M}^{2,\varepsilon}$ is reversible - because it's the coarse-graining of the reversible chain $\mathcal{M}^{1,\varepsilon}$. On the other hand, by the ε-PR condition, it is close to the 1-dimensional chain defined by sampling uniformly at random a word of weight d, and adding it to a given word. Together these two conditions imply a concise condition on its stationary distribution $\pi^{2,\varepsilon}$ - namely the weakly-binomial property.

Proof. Let $\mathcal{M}^1$ be the random walk using all words of weight d, and let $\mathcal{M}^{1,\varepsilon}$ be the random walk using generators of the code. Denote the stationary distributions similarly, as is described in the statement of Proposition 31. By Eq. (42) and Eq. (44), the stationary distributions have the form:

$$\pi_j^{2,\varepsilon} = \frac{B_j}{2^m} \qquad \pi_j^2 = \frac{\binom{n}{j}}{2^n} \tag{52}$$

Proposition 31 implies that, for $j \in [n\varepsilon^{1/(2d)}, n(1-\varepsilon^{1/(2d)})]$:

$$\frac{B_j}{2^m} \leq \frac{2^{\varepsilon^{1/2}n}\binom{n}{j}}{2^n} \tag{53}$$

or

$$B_j \leq \frac{2^{\varepsilon^{1/2}n}\binom{n}{j}}{|C^\perp|} \tag{54}$$

For j outside the error interval, we know nothing. We can then write the general upper bound for all j by including an additive "error floor term". This error floor term has magnitude:

$$\binom{n}{n\varepsilon^{1/(2d)}} \leq 2^{nH(\varepsilon^{1/(2d)})} \tag{55}$$

So we can write the general upper bound as:

$$\forall j \in [0, \dots n], \quad B_j \leq \frac{2^{\varepsilon^{(1/2)} n} \binom{n}{j}}{|C^{\perp}|} + 2^{nH(\varepsilon^{1/(2d)})}. \tag{56}$$

Hence $\mathcal{C}$ is weakly-binomial with parameters $\zeta = \varepsilon^{1/2}$ and $\eta = H(\varepsilon^{1/(2d)})$. □

4 Weakly-binomial spaces have bounded minimal distance

In this section we use the definition of weakly-binomial spaces to argue an upper-bound on the minimal distance of quantum codes.

Lemma 32. ***Large QECC distance implies large deviation from binomial***
Let $\mathcal{Q} = (C_1, C_2)_n$ be a family of quantum $[[n, k, d]]$ CSS codes as described in Definition 8, where $\delta_{min} = d/n > 0$ is a constant independent of n. Put $m = 1/2 - k/(2n) = \dim(C_1) = \dim(C_2)$. Suppose that C_1, C_2 are spanned by generators of weight d, such that in the hypergraph of each of C_1, C_2 the degree is some constant $K_1, K_2 = O(1)$. If C_1 is (ζ, η) weakly-binomial for $\eta \leq 2^{-2\log(2d)/d}$ and $\zeta < \eta^d$ then $\delta_{min} \leq 4H(\eta)$.

Proof. Define

$$f_{d,\eta}(\gamma) = 2\gamma + (1 - 2\gamma) H\left(\frac{\eta - \gamma}{1 - 2\gamma}\right) + \frac{1}{d^2} H(2\gamma d) - H(\eta) \tag{57}$$

We use now Fact 34 that analyzes $f_{d,\eta}$: by this fact, whenever $\eta \leq 2^{-2\log(2d)/d}$ we have:

$$h_{d,\eta} \equiv f_{d,\eta}(\eta^d) \geq \eta^d. \tag{58}$$

By assumption, C_1 is (ζ, η)-weakly binomial, for $\zeta < \eta^d \leq h_{d,\eta}$. Fix $\gamma = \eta^d$, $t = \eta n, j = \gamma n$. Consider the polynomial $P_t^2(x)$. Using Eq. (19) express $P_t^2(x)$ in the Kravchuk basis as:

$$P_t^2(k) = \sum_{i=0}^{t} \binom{2i}{i} \binom{n-2i}{t-i} P_{2i}(k), \tag{59}$$

and denote

$$\alpha_{2i} := \binom{2i}{i} \binom{n-2i}{t-i}. \tag{60}$$

Let $\{B_k\}$ be the weight enumerator of C_1 defined inDefinition 17 and $\{B_k^{\perp}\}$ be the weight enumerator of $C_1^{\perp}$ defined in Definition 19. By Mac-Williams theorem 21 and Eq. (59):

$$|C_1| \sum_{i=0}^{t} \alpha_{2i} B_{2i}^{\perp} = \sum_{k=0}^{n} B_k P_t(k)^2 \tag{61}$$

Since the RHS is a weighted average of B_k with positive coefficients, we can apply the upper bound we have on B_k assuming weak-binomiality:

$$|C_1| \sum_{i=0}^{t} \alpha_{2i} B_{2i}^{\perp} \leq \sum_{k=0}^{n} \left[\frac{2^{\zeta n} \binom{n}{k}}{|C_1^{\perp}|} + 2^{\eta n} \right] P_t(k)^2 \tag{62}$$

$$= \left[\sum_{k=0}^{n} \frac{2^{\zeta n}\binom{n}{k}|C_1|}{2^n} P_t(k)^2\right] + \left[\sum_{k=0}^{n} P_t(k)^2 2^{\eta n}\right] \tag{63}$$

Now apply Eq. (59) to the first term:

$$= \left[\sum_{k=0}^{n} \frac{2^{\zeta n}\binom{n}{k}|C_1|}{2^n} \sum_{i=0}^{t} \alpha_{2i} P_{2i}(k)\right] + \left[\sum_{k=0}^{n} P_t(k)^2 2^{\eta n}\right] \tag{64}$$

Reversing the order of summation yields:

$$= \sum_{i=0}^{t} \frac{2^{\zeta n}|C_1|\alpha_{2i}}{2^n} \sum_{k=0}^{n} \binom{n}{k} P_{2i}(k) + \sum_{k=0}^{n} P_t(k)^2 2^{\eta n} \tag{65}$$

Now observe that we can interpret the inner sum as an inner product between P_{2i} and P_0 - i.e. the constant function. By Lemma 13, $2^n \delta_{i,0}$ must be zero unless $i = 0$. Thus, we have:

$$= \frac{2^{\zeta n}|C_1|\alpha_0}{2^n} 2^n + \sum_{k=0}^{n} P_t(k)^2 2^{\eta n} \tag{66}$$

Now we can apply Lemma 16

$$\leq 2^{\zeta n}|C_1|\alpha_0 + n\binom{n}{t}^2 2^{\eta n} \tag{67}$$

and so by Equation 60 we derive the inequality:

$$|C_1| \sum_{i=0}^{t} \alpha_{2i} B_{2i}^{\perp} \leq 2^{\zeta n}|C_1|\binom{n}{t} + n\binom{n}{t}^2 2^{\eta n} \tag{68}$$

Dividing by $|C_1|$,

$$\sum_{i=0}^{t} \alpha_{2i} B_{2i}^{\perp} \leq 2^{\zeta n}\binom{n}{t} + n\binom{n}{t}^2 \frac{2^{\eta n}}{|C_1|} \leq_p 2^{\zeta n}\binom{n}{t} + \binom{n}{t}^2 \frac{2^{\eta n}}{|C_1|} \tag{69}$$

This implies for all $i \leq t$:

$$\alpha_{2i} B_{2i}^{\perp} \leq_p 2^{\zeta n}\binom{n}{t} + \binom{n}{t}^2 \frac{2^{\eta n}}{|C_1|} \tag{70}$$

and in particular for $j = \gamma n = \eta^d n$:

$$\alpha_{2j} B_{2j}^{\perp} \leq_p 2^{\zeta n}\binom{n}{t} + \binom{n}{t}^2 \frac{2^{\eta n}}{|C_1|} \tag{71}$$

Applying Eq. (60):

$$\binom{2j}{j}\binom{n-2j}{t-j} B_{2j}^{\perp} \leq_p 2^{\zeta n}\binom{n}{t} + \binom{n}{t}^2 \frac{2^{\eta n}}{|C_1|} \tag{72}$$

By the definition of CSS codes (Definition 8), $C_2 \subseteq C_1^{\perp}$ so we can lower bound the weight enumerator of $C_1^{\perp}$ with the weight enumerator of C_2. Since by hypothesis C_2 is also generated by a d-uniform hyper-graph of some fixed degree $K_2 = O(1)$, we can apply Proposition 33:

$$\binom{2j}{j}\binom{n-2j}{t-j}\binom{\frac{n}{d^2}}{\frac{2j}{d}} \leq_p 2^{\zeta n}\binom{n}{t} + \binom{n}{t}^2 \frac{2^{\eta n}}{|C_1|} \tag{73}$$

Next, by the binomial coefficient approximations in Proposition 35:

$$2^{2j+(n-2j)H\left(\frac{t-j}{n-2j}\right)+\frac{n}{d^2}H\left(\frac{2jd}{n}\right)} \leq_p 2^{\zeta n + nH\left(\frac{t}{n}\right)} + 2^{n(2H(t/n)+\eta-m/n)} \tag{74}$$

Now rewrite Eq. (74) in terms of γ and η:

$$2^{n\left(2\gamma+(1-2\gamma)H\left(\frac{\eta-\gamma}{1-2\gamma}\right)+\frac{1}{d^2}H(2\gamma d)\right)} \leq_p 2^{n(\zeta+H(\eta))} + 2^{n(2H(\eta)+\eta-m/n)} \tag{75}$$

Now observe by that by our choice of parameters the first summand of RHS is negligible compared to LHS as follows: By assumption:

$$f_{d,\eta}(\eta^d) = h_{d,\eta} \geq \eta^d > \zeta. \tag{76}$$

or, by definition of $f_{d,\eta}$:

$$2\gamma + (1-2\gamma)H\left(\frac{\eta-\gamma}{1-2\gamma}\right) + \frac{1}{d^2}H\left(2\gamma d\right) = h_{d,\eta} + H(\eta) > \zeta + H(\eta). \tag{77}$$

Therefore, together with Eq. (75) this implies the following upper-bound:

$$\frac{1}{d^2}H(2\gamma d) + 2\gamma + (1-2\gamma)H\left(\frac{\eta-\gamma}{1-2\gamma}\right) \leq 2H(\eta) + \eta - m/n \tag{78}$$

or

$$f_{d,\eta}(\eta^d) - H(\eta) \leq \eta - m/n \tag{79}$$

or

$$H(\eta) - f_{d,\eta}(\eta^d) \geq m/n - \eta \tag{80}$$

Since $f_{d,\eta}(\gamma) > \zeta > 0$,

$$H(\eta) + \eta \geq m/n \tag{81}$$

If we let $\rho = 1 - 2\frac{m}{n} = k/n$ denote the rate of the quantum CSS code, then we can write:

$$\frac{1-\rho}{2} \leq H(\eta) + \eta \tag{82}$$

which implies

$$1 - 2H(\eta) - 2\eta \leq \rho \tag{83}$$

Now apply Proposition 22. We obtain:

$$1 - 2H(\eta) - 2\eta \leq 1 - \frac{\delta_{min}}{2}\log(3) - H\left(\frac{\delta_{min}}{2}\right) \tag{84}$$

It is easy to see that the RHS is a convex function of δ_{min}. Clearly the linear function δ_{min} is convex, and the binary entropy function is well known to be concave (hence $-H(x)$ is convex). So, we can upper bound the RHS with a straight line with endpoints at the beginning and end of our interval of interest. Define:

$$g(\delta_{min}) = 1 - \frac{\delta_{min}}{2}\log(3) - H\left(\frac{\delta_{min}}{2}\right) \tag{85}$$

$g(0) = 1$ and let $z > 0$ be the first point such that $g(z) = 0$. It can be verified computationally that this fixed value of z exists in the interval $[0.35, 0.4]$. So we can upper bound:

$$\forall \delta_{min} \in [0, z] \;\; g(\delta_{min}) \leq 1 - \frac{1}{z}\delta_{min} \tag{86}$$

So, we can write:

$$1 - 2H(\eta) - 2\eta \leq 1 - \frac{1}{z}\delta_{min} \tag{87}$$

Since $z < 1$, this implies:

$$\delta_{min} \leq 2(H(\eta) + \eta). \tag{88}$$

By Proposition 36, for $\eta \leq 1/2$

$$\delta_{min} \leq 4H(\eta) \tag{89}$$

□

Proposition 33. ***Lower bound on the number of words in a sparsely-generated space***
Let C be an m-dimensional linear code over $\mathbb{F}_2$ on n bits. Suppose each generator of the code has weight d, and that the degree of every vertex is K . For k divisible by d and $k \leq n/d$ we have:

$$B_k \geq \binom{\frac{n}{d^2}}{\frac{k}{d}} \tag{90}$$

Proof. The number of generators is $g = nK/d$. We find a set of non-overlapping generators of maximal size. By choosing a generator, and discarding all its neighbors we can find such a non-overlapping set of size at least n/d^2. Consider any subset of k/d such generators. Any such set corresponds to a word in C of weight exactly k. Since $k \leq n/d$ then $k/d \leq n/d^2$ so the number of such words is therefore at least the binomial coefficient: $\binom{n/(d^2)}{k/d}$. □

5 Proof of Theorem 1

Proof. Let $\mathcal{X} = (X_0, X_1, X_2)$ be a 2-complex and denote by $\mathcal{C}(\mathcal{X}) = [[n, k, d_{min}]]$ be the associated quantum code, and write $\mathcal{C}(\mathcal{X}) = (C_1, C_2)$. Suppose that $\mathcal{X}$ is ε-PR. By Lemma 28 we have that C_1 is weakly-binomial with parameters $\zeta = \varepsilon^{1/2}, \eta = H(\varepsilon^{1/(2d)})$. Since by assumption ∂_1, ∂_2^T both have row weight d we can invoke Lemma 32. The lemma states that if $\eta \leq 2^{-2\log(2d)/d}$ and $\zeta < \eta^d$ then $\delta_{min} \leq 4H(\eta)$. To check that this is indeed the case, observe that by assumption

$$\eta = H(\varepsilon^{1/(2d)}) \leq 2^{-2\log(2d)/d}.$$

In addition, we have

$$\eta^d = \left[H(\varepsilon^{1/(2d)})\right]^d > \left[\varepsilon^{1/(2d)} \log\left(\frac{1}{\varepsilon^{1/(2d)}}\right)\right]^d = \varepsilon^{1/2}\left(\frac{1}{2d}\right)^d \log^d\left(\frac{1}{\varepsilon}\right) \tag{91}$$

Also by assumption $\varepsilon \leq 2^{-2d}$ so we can lower bound the above equation as:

$$\eta^d > \varepsilon^{1/2}\left(\frac{1}{2d}\right)^d \log^d\left(\frac{1}{\varepsilon}\right) \geq \varepsilon^{1/2} \tag{92}$$

The upper bound we obtain on the distance is:

$$\delta_{min} \leq 4H(H(\varepsilon^{1/(2d)})) \tag{93}$$

For $\eta \leq 1/2$, applying Proposition 36

$$\delta_{min} \leq 4H(2\varepsilon^{1/(2d)} \log(1/\varepsilon^{1/(2d)})) \tag{94}$$

Applying it once more,

$$\delta_{min} \leq 4 \cdot 2 \cdot 2\varepsilon^{1/(2d)} \log(1/\varepsilon^{1/(2d)}) \log\left(\frac{1}{2\varepsilon^{1/(2d)} \log(1/\varepsilon^{1/(2d)})}\right) \tag{95}$$

$$= 16\varepsilon^{1/(2d)} \log(1/\varepsilon^{1/(2d)}) \left(1 + \log(1/\varepsilon^{1/(2d)}) - \log(\log(1/\varepsilon^{1/(2d)}))\right) \tag{96}$$

$$\leq 48\varepsilon^{1/(2d)} \log(1/\varepsilon^{1/(2d)})^2 \tag{97}$$

$$= \frac{12}{d^2}\varepsilon^{1/(2d)} \log^2(1/\varepsilon) \tag{98}$$

□

5.1 Note on the proof

The reader may have noticed that the ideal Markov chain $\mathcal{M}^1$ may not span all of $\mathbb{F}_2^n$, depending on the constant d.

If d is odd, then $\mathcal{M}^1$ must span all of $\mathbb{F}_2^n$, so our proof follows exactly as written. This follows from a simple induction argument. With any word of weight d, odd, we can make any word of weight 2. With any word of weight 2 we can make any even weight word. Using any word of even weight and any word of weight d allows us to make any word of any odd weight.

Only minor modifications are needed to Proposition 31 if d is even. In this case the chain $\mathcal{M}^1$ only spans the even words, so we can only telescope on nonzero stationary probabilities in Eq. (49). Additionally, the inequality $\pi_1(n/2) \geq 1/n^k$ only holds up to a factor of 2, not significantly effecting our bounds.

A Technical estimates

Fact 34. *Let*

$$f_{d,\beta}(\gamma) = 2\gamma + (1-2\gamma)H\left(\frac{\beta-\gamma}{1-2\gamma}\right) + \frac{1}{d^2}H(2\gamma d) - H(\beta) \tag{99}$$

Then whenever $\beta \leq 2^{-2\log(2d)/d}$ we have:

$$h_{d,\beta} \equiv f_{d,\beta}(\beta^d) \geq \beta^d.$$

Proof. Expanding $H\left(\frac{\beta-\beta^d}{1-2\beta^d}\right)$ to first order

$$H\left(\frac{\beta-\beta^d}{1-2\beta^d}\right) \geq H(\beta) + \beta^d \cdot \log(\beta).$$

$$\begin{aligned}
f_{d,\beta}(\beta^d) &= 2\beta^d + (1-2\beta^d)\cdot(H(\beta)+\beta^d\cdot\log(\beta)) + \frac{1}{d^2}H\left(2\beta^d d\right) - H(\beta) && (100)\\
&= 2\beta^d + H(\beta) - 2\beta^d H(\beta) + \beta^d\log(\beta) - 2\beta^{2d}\log(\beta) + \frac{1}{d^2}H\left(2\beta^d d\right) - H(\beta) && (101)\\
&\geq 2\beta^d + \beta^d\log(\beta) + \frac{1}{d^2}H\left(2\beta^d d\right) && (102)\\
&\geq \beta^d\log(\beta) + \frac{1}{d^2}H\left(2\beta^d d\right) && (103)\\
&\geq \beta^d\log(\beta) - \frac{1}{d^2}(2\beta^d d)\log(2\beta^d d) && (104)\\
&= \beta^d\log(\beta) - \frac{1}{d^2}(2\beta^d d)(\log(\beta^d)+\log(2d)) && (105)\\
&= -\beta^d\log(\beta) - \beta^d(2\log(2d)/d) && (106)\\
&\geq -\frac{1}{2}\beta^d\log(\beta) \geq \beta^d && (107)
\end{aligned}$$

where the inequality before last assumes $\beta \leq 2^{-2\log(2d)/d}$. □

The following fact appears in [FG06, p. 427] and [Ash90, p. 121].

Proposition 35. *Let $1 \leq k \leq n$. If $\varepsilon = k/n$, then*

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{8n\varepsilon(1-\varepsilon)}}2^{H(\varepsilon)n} \leq \sum_{i=0}^{k}\binom{n}{i} \leq 2^{H(\varepsilon)n}. \tag{108}$$

This implies that:

$$\binom{n}{k} \leq 2^{H(\varepsilon)n} \tag{109}$$

and

$$\frac{1}{k\sqrt{8n\varepsilon(1-\varepsilon)}}2^{nH(\varepsilon)} \leq \binom{n}{k} \tag{110}$$

Or,

$$2^{nH(\varepsilon)} \leq_p \binom{n}{\varepsilon n} \leq_p 2^{nH(\varepsilon)} \tag{111}$$

Proposition 36. *The following holds for all $x \in [0, 1/2]$,*

$$x \leq H(x) \leq 2x\log(1/x) \tag{112}$$

Proof. The first inequality $x \leq H(x)$ holds since

$$H(x) \geq x \log(1/x) \geq x \ \forall x \in [0, 1/2] \tag{113}$$

To prove the second inequality, define the function:

$$g(x) = x \log(1/x) - (1-x) \log(1/(1-x)) \tag{114}$$

By taking the derivative and simplifying, its clear that the only local maximum of the function is at $x = 1/2$. Also, we can see that the derivative is positive at $x = 1/4$, and that $g(0) = 0 = g(1/2)$. The inequality follows. □

B Acknowledgments

The authors wish to thank Tali Kaufman, Alex Lubotzky, and Peter Shor for useful conversations. LE was inspired in part by ideas presented at the "Conference on High-Dimensional Expanders 2016", and thanks the organizers for inviting him. KT wishes to acknowledge the summer school at Weizmann Institute, "High Dimensional Expanders, Inverse Theorems and PCPs" for providing valuable insight into expanders. MO was funded by the Leverhulme Trust Early Career Fellowship (ECF-2015-256) and would like to thank MIT, where most of this work was done, for hospitality. KT is funded by the NSF through the STC for Science of Information under grant number CCF0-939370.

References

[AC88] Noga Alon and Fan RK Chung. Explicit construction of linear sized tolerant networks. *Annals of Discrete Mathematics*, 38:15–19, 1988. doi:10.1016/S0167-5060(08)70766-0.

[AE15] Dorit Aharonov and Lior Eldar. The commuting local Hamiltonian problem on locally expanding graphs is approximable in NP. *Quantum Information Processing*, 14(1):83–101, 2015. arXiv:1311.7378, doi:10.1007/s11128-014-0877-9.

[AL99] Alexei Ashikhmin and Simon Litsyn. Upper bounds on the size of quantum codes. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 45(4):1206–1215, May 1999. arXiv:quant-ph/9709049, doi:10.1109/18.761270.

[Alo86] Noga Alon. Eigenvalues and expanders. *Combinatorica*, 6(2):83–96, 1986. doi:10.1007/BF02579166.

[Ash90] Robert Ash. *Information theory*. Dover Publications, New York, 1990.

[BH13] Fernando G.S.L. Brandao and Aram W. Harrow. Product-state approximations to quantum ground states. In *Proceedings of the Forty-fifth Annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing*, STOC '13, pages 871–880, New York, NY, USA, 2013. ACM. arXiv:1310.0017, doi:10.1145/2488608.2488719.

[BK01] Sergey B. Bravyi and Alexei Yu. Kitaev. Quantum codes on a lattice with boundary. *Quantum Computers and Computing*, 2(1):43–48, 2001. arXiv:quant-ph/9811052.

[BL06] Yonatan Bilu and Nathan Linial. Lifts, discrepancy and nearly optimal spectral gap. *Combinatorica*, 26(5):495–519, 2006. arXiv:math/0312022, doi:10.1007/s00493-006-0029-7.

[BMD07] Héctor Bombín and Miguel A. Martin-Delgado. Homological error correction: Classical and quantum codes. *Journal of Mathematical Physics*, 48(5):052105, 2007. arXiv:quant-ph/0605094, doi:10.1063/1.2731356.

[Bom13] Héctor Bombín. An introduction to topological quantum codes. In Daniel A. Lidar and Todd A. Brun, editors, *Quantum Error Correction*. Cambridge University Press, New York, 2013. arXiv:1311.0277.

[BPT10] Sergey Bravyi, David Poulin, and Barbara Terhal. Tradeoffs for reliable quantum information storage in 2D systems. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 104(5):050503, Feb 2010. arXiv:0909.5200, doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.104.050503.

[BT09] Sergey Bravyi and Barbara Terhal. A no-go theorem for a two-dimensional self-correcting quantum memory based on stabilizer codes. *New Journal of Physics*, 11(4):043029, 2009. arXiv:0810.1983, doi:10.1088/1367-2630/11/4/043029.

[Che69] Jeff Cheeger. A lower bound for the smallest eigenvalue of the Laplacian. In *Proceedings of the Princeton conference in honor of Professor S. Bochner*, pages 195–199, 1969.

[CS96] Arthur R. Calderbank and Peter W. Shor. Good quantum error-correcting codes exist. *Phys. Rev. A*, 54(2):1098–1105, Aug 1996. arXiv:quant-ph/9512032, doi:10.1103/PhysRevA.54.1098.

[EH15] Lior Eldar and Aram W. Harrow. Local Hamiltonians with no low-energy trivial states. 2015. arXiv:1510.02082.

[EK16] Shai Evra and Tali Kaufman. Bounded degree cosystolic expanders of every dimension. In *Proceedings of the 48th Annual ACM SIGACT Symposium on Theory of Computing*, STOC 2016, pages 36–48, New York, NY, USA, 2016. ACM. arXiv:1510.00839, doi:10.1145/2897518.2897543.

[FG06] Jörg Flum and Martin Grohe. *Parameterized complexity theory*. Texts in Theoretical Computer Science. An EATCS Series. Springer, Berlin London, 2006. URL: https://books.google.co.uk/books?id=VfJz6hvFAjoC.

[FH14] Michael H. Freedman and Matthew B. Hastings. Quantum systems on non-k-hyperfinite complexes: A generalization of classical statistical mechanics on expander graphs. *Quantum Information and Computation*, 14(1&2):0144–0180, Jan 2014. URL: http://www.rintonpress.com/journals/qiconline.html#v14n12, arXiv:1301.1363.

[Got14] Daniel Gottesman. Fault-tolerant quantum computation with constant overhead. *Quantum Information and Computation*, 14(15&16):1338–1371, Nov 2014. URL: http://www.rintonpress.com/journals/qiconline.html#v14n1516, arXiv:1310.2984.

[Has16] Matthew B. Hastings. Quantum codes from high-dimensional manifolds. 2016. arXiv:1608.05089.

[HLW06a] Shlomo Hoory, Nathan Linial, and Avi Wigderson. Expander graphs and their applications. *Bull. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 43(4):439–561, Oct 2006. doi:10.1090/S0273-0979-06-01126-8.

[HLW06b] Shlomo Hoory, Nathan Linial, and Avi Wigderson. Expander graphs and their applications. *Bull. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 43:439–561, 2006. URL: http://www.ams.org/bull/2006-43-04/S0273-0979-06-01126-8/home.html, doi:10.1090/S0273-0979-06-01126-8.

[Kit97] Alexei Yu Kitaev. Quantum computations: algorithms and error correction. *Russian Mathematical Surveys*, 52(6):1191, 1997. doi:10.1070/RM1997v052n06ABEH002155.

[KKL16] Tali Kaufman, David Kazhdan, and Alexander Lubotzky. Isoperimetric inequalities for Ramanujan complexes and topological expanders. *Geometric and Functional Analysis*, 26(1):250–287, 2016. arXiv:1409.1397, doi:10.1007/s00039-016-0362-y.

[KL97] Ilia Krasikov and Simon Litsyn. Estimates for the range of binomiality in codes' spectra. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 43(3):987–991, May 1997. URL: http://bura.brunel.ac.uk/handle/2438/3323, doi:10.1109/18.568707.

[KL14] Tali Kaufman and Alexander Lubotzky. High dimensional expanders and property testing. In *Proceedings of the 5th Conference on Innovations in Theoretical Computer Science*, ITCS '14, pages 501–506, New York, NY, USA, 2014. ACM. arXiv:1312.2367, doi:10.1145/2554797.2554842.

[LB13] Daniel A. Lidar and Todd A. Brun. *Quantum Error Correction*. Cambridge University Press, 2013. URL: https://books.google.com/books?id=XV9sAAAAQBAJ.

[LM06] Nathan Linial and Roy Meshulam. Homological connectivity of random 2-complexes. *Combinatorica*, 26(4):475–487, 2006. doi:10.1007/s00493-006-0027-9.

[LTZ15] A. Leverrier, J. P. Tillich, and G. Zèmor. Quantum expander codes. In *Foundations of Computer Science (FOCS), 2015 IEEE 56th Annual Symposium on*, pages 810–824, Oct 2015. doi:10.1109/FOCS.2015.55.

[Lub12] Alexander Lubotzky. Expander graphs in pure and applied mathematics. *Bull. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 49(1):113–162, Jan 2012. arXiv:1105.2389, doi:10.1090/S0273-0979-2011-01359-3.

[Lub14] Alexander Lubotzky. Ramanujan complexes and high dimensional expanders. *Japanese Journal of Mathematics*, 9(2):137–169, 2014. arXiv:1301.1028, doi:10.1007/s11537-014-1265-z.

[MS77] Florence Jessie MacWilliams and Neil James Alexander Sloane. *The theory of error correcting codes*. North-Holland mathematical library. North-Holland Pub. Co. New York, Amsterdam, New York, 1977.

[NC11] Michael A. Nielsen and Isaac L. Chuang. *Quantum Computation and Quantum Information: 10th Anniversary Edition*. Cambridge University Press, New York, NY, USA, 10th edition, 2011.

[Par13] Ori Parzanchevski. Mixing in high-dimensional expanders. 2013. arXiv:1310.6477.

[PRT16] Ori Parzanchevski, Ron Rosenthal, and Ran J. Tessler. Isoperimetric inequalities in simplicial complexes. *Combinatorica*, 36(2):195–227, 2016. arXiv:1207.0638, doi:10.1007/s00493-014-3002-x.

[SS96] Michael Sipser and Daniel A. Spielman. Expander codes. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 42(6):1710–1722, Nov 1996. doi:10.1109/18.556667.

[Ste96a] Andrew M. Steane. Error correcting codes in quantum theory. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 77(5):793–797, Jul 1996. doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.77.793.

[Ste96b] Andrew M. Steane. Multiple-particle interference and quantum error correction. *Proceedings of the Royal Society of London A: Mathematical, Physical and Engineering Sciences*, 452(1954):2551–2577, 1996. arXiv:quant-ph/9601029, doi:10.1098/rspa.1996.0136.